

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, 8-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 16, 19 and 20 are amended, Claims 2, 8, 14 and 17 are cancelled and Claim 21 is added by way of the present amendment. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the disclosure as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Timmer (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0107895) in view of Shurts (U.S. Pat. No. 5,572,673).

Before turning to the outstanding art rejections, it is believed that a brief review of the claimed invention would be helpful.

In a non-limiting example, illustrated in Figure 10 two users, “A” and “B”, are able to exchange information and foster human relations using the claimed invention. For instance, the information communication device “A” may have visited a movie theatre earlier in the week. During this visit, the name of the movie and the location of the theatre are entered into the metadata storage unit of the user’s information communication device “A” automatically by a wireless transmitter located at the theatre. Because the user “A” has programmed the security table of his information communication device as is shown in Figure 5, the movie theatre transmitter is able to deliver metadata to the information communication device of user “A” and store it in a partition of the device corresponding to security level 1. User “B” may have also watched the same movie at a different location two weeks ago and metadata relating to the movie was also entered into security level 1 of user “B”s information communication device. As shown in Figure 10, when user “A” and user “B” both enter the room which includes device “C”, device “C” scans the publicly available partitions

(corresponding to security level 1 for instance) of each information communication device. The device “C” then matches the movie seen by user “A” and “B” and displays a notification letting user “B” know that user “A” has seen the movie and notifying “A” that user “B” has seen the movie. This allows users “A” and “B” to know which users they have things in common with such as they have been to the same parties or they have been to the theatre and seen the same movies.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-20 under §103(a) as unpatentable over Timmer and Shurts, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended Claim 16, recites,

An information exchange and human relation fostering supporting method for supporting information exchange and fostering of human relations on the virtual world, comprising:

transmitting metadata to a plurality of mobile communications devices at a plurality of different physical locations, the metadata relating to activities and interests of a user of each mobile communication device and including a log providing information on locations visited by the user;

authenticating each mobile communication device within range of a stationary communication device with the stationary communication device;

uploading the metadata from the authenticated mobile communication devices to the stationary communication device;

comparing the uploaded metadata to find matching activities and interests;

displaying the matching activities and interests and corresponding users discovered by the comparing;

deleting the uploaded metadata from the stationary communications device.

Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19-21 recite similar features with regard to the metadata corresponding to locations visited.

Timmer describes a personalized book that includes content on the user’s choice and content related to the user’s preferences. However, Timmer does not describe or suggest that

metadata includes a log providing information on locations visited by the user, as is recited in Claim 16.

The outstanding Action relies on Shurts as curing the deficiencies of Timmer with regard to the claimed invention.

Shurts describes a database which allows security settings to be included with different database objects such as database tables or rows. In addition, Shurts describes that attributes of database object (such as table ID or owner) can be included in the database. However, Shurts does not describe or suggest that metadata includes a log providing information on locations visited by the user, as is recited in Claim 16.

Nevertheless, the outstanding Action states on page 5 that the combination of Shurts and Timmer describes this feature. Specifically, the outstanding Action states:

Shurts is directed to a secured database system and the purpose of databases is storing linked pieces of information such as the user, its visits and the visited place. A system capable of storing data related to a user is well capable of storing the information of locations visited by the user. In other words, barring any unexpected result, a person skilled in art would have store the data indicating location visited by a user if an application requires such data. In addition, Timmer paragraph 31 clearly shows storing locations visited by the user).

Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions.

Specifically, Shurts simply describes a database system that authenticates a user who is accessing the data and refuses access to a user that does not have a license for the access. Databases of the type described in Shurts typically store data such as video, audio, etc. however, Shurts does not describe what type of data is to be stored in the databases described therein, due to the fact that Shurts is not particularly interested in the material actually stored in the database. The outstanding Action tacitly acknowledges this point but states that one skilled in the art would have known how to presumably make the metadata location information if such a need existed. To evidence this point the outstanding Action points to

Timmer as illustrating that locations visited by the user are stored. Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions.

Initially Applicants respectfully submit that Timmer does not describe or suggest that metadata, including the location that the user is visiting and information regarding the visited location, is transmitted to the mobile communications device of the user at the visited location. Instead, Timmer simply describes that a user can create a travel scrapbook. There is no description or suggestion of data being transmitted to the user indicating the location that the user is visiting. Further, Timmer in no way describes or suggests that a metadata including a log of the locations the user has visited is found on the user's mobile device.

Further, Shurts merely describes a database, there is no description or suggestion in Shurts that location information is stored in the database or that location information is transmitted to a mobile device from a transmitter located at the respective location. These features are simply not described or suggested in these references.

In addition, with regard to new Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Timmer and Shurts in no way describes or suggests all of the steps recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 7, 13, 16 and 19-21, and claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Timmer and Shurts considered individually or in combination.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073